

REMARKS

1-8, 15, and 16 have been examined. Claims 1-8, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 2, 7, 15 and 16 without prejudice or disclaimer.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-8, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly does not support various claimed features. Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims, which are supported by *at least* page 22, line 20 to page 23, line 26 of the Specification, overcome the rejection.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over WO 9827570 to Iguchi et al. (“Iguchi”), Korean Application No. 1999-85889 (“KR ‘889”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,797,975 to Nishiyama et al. (“Nishiyama”)

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iguchi, KR ‘889, and Nishiyama. For *at least* the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A. Claim 1

For example, in claim 1, the inspecting step determines whether or not an amount of said phosphor material in each of said cells is a suitable amount in accordance with an intensity distribution of reflected light in each of said cells. The reflected light is obtained by radiating visible light onto a surface of said phosphor material before said drying step.

On the other hand, Iguchi discloses a method of applying a phosphor material paste to a surface of a plasma display panel. The phosphor paste is printed between barrier ribs. However, the reference does not describe any details about an inspection process of the paste.

KR '889 does not cure the deficient teachings of Iguchi. For instance, KR '889 discloses a method of inspecting phosphor materials that are applied to a plasma display panel. However, the reference does not disclose or teach the inspection of the applied phosphor materials comprises determining whether or not an amount of said phosphor material in each of said cells is a suitable amount in accordance with an intensity distribution of reflected light in each of said cells.

Nishiyama does not cure the deficient teachings of Iguchi and Kr '889. For example, Nishiyama discloses a method of inspecting pattern defects in a plasma display panel using white light. However, the reference fails to suggest inspecting applied phosphor material and determining whether or not an amount of said phosphor material in each of said cells is a suitable amount in accordance with an intensity distribution of reflected light in each of said cells.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Iguchi, KR '889, and Nishiyama.

B. Claims 2, 4-8, and 15

Since claims 4-6 and 8 depend upon claim 1, Applicants submit that they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Since claims 2, 7, and 15 have been canceled, the rejection thereto is rendered moot.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Iguchi, KR '889, Nishiyama, U.S. Patent No. 5,998,085 to Isberg et al. ("Isberg") and U.S. Patent Publ. No. 2002/0063527 to Hayashi et al. ("Hayashi")

Claims 3, 4, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iguchi, KR '889, and Nishiyama and further in view of Isberg and Hayashi.

Since claims 3 and 4 depend upon claim 1, and since Isberg and Hayashi do not cure the deficient teachings of Iguchi, KR '889, and Nishiyama with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that claims 3 and 4 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Also, since claim 16 has been canceled, the rejection thereto is rendered moot.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Iguchi

Claims 1, 5, 7, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iguchi.

A. Claim 1

Since Iguchi does not suggest the all of the features of claim 1 for at least the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the reference.

B. Claims 5, 7, and 8

Since claims 5 and 8 depend upon claim 1, Applicants submit that they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Since claim 7 has been canceled, the rejection thereto is rendered moot.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Quadeer A. Ahmed
Registration No. 60,835

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 31, 2007